Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that no record of them can be found by diligent inquiry. The few species at stake in the present case are comparatively of little consequence, but the principle involved is all important, and if disregarded, scientific nomenclature will become worthless, and honest research lose its just reward.

TINOCERAS AND ITS ALLIES.

BY PROFESSOR O. C. MARSH.

SINCE the article on page 217 of the April NATURALIST was printed, another pamphlet by Prof. Cope on the same subject has been received (March 20th). In this paper, which is dated March 14th, 1873, and illustrated by four plates, Prof. Cope has at last adopted nearly all my views as to the characters and affinities of the *Dinocerata*, as well as most of my corrections of his errors, although without giving credit in either case. Unfortunately, he still misinterprets the structure of this group on several points, and most of his dates are incorrect as before. On nearly every page of the paper, moreover, new errors may be detected, a few only of which can be corrected here, for want of space.

1st. Prof. Cope is wrong in assigning only three sacral vertebræ to the *Dinocerata*, as *Dinoceras*, the type of the group, certainly has four, and the other genera probably as many. 2d. The neck in *Tinoceras grandis* Marsh (or ? *Tinoceras cornutus*) was much more than a foot in length, rather than less, as the cervicals in the Yale Museum clearly prove. 3d. Prof. Cope is entirely in error in saying that the muzzle in this species could not reach the ground by several feet; the animal really having no use for the long proboscis which Prof. Cope persists in putting on him. 4th. The specimen described as *Eobasileus cornutus* was fully adult, as the teeth show, and the differences between it and the type of *Tinoceras grandis* may be due to age. 5th. The nasal bones in this genus do not form the inner half of the middle horn-cores, but only a small portion of the base, the cores being essentially on the maxillaries. 6th. The anterior extension of the malar bone is not in *Dinoceras* much less than in Perissodactyls. 7th. The

tusks figured in plate I of Prof. Cope's paper are not in their true position, and in plate II the left tusk is placed on the right side, thus entirely reversing its characters. 8th. The name *Loxolophodon* was not applied to the genus *Tinoceras*, Aug. 19th, 1872, but long afterward, and then altered to *Lefalophodon*, with specific names all different from those now claimed. A good example of the inaccuracy which seems inseparable from Prof. Cope's work is seen in the explanation of the plates of this paper, where two serious mistakes occur in the first line.

Prof. Cope concludes with some remarks about nomenclature, evidently aiming to save, if possible, some of his names which are anticipated by mine. His views as to what constitutes publication are absurd, and would not be accepted by any scientific authority. His precepts about describing genera may be fitly compared with his practice, without going beyond the *Dinocerata*. The name *Loxolophodon* Cope was first given, without description, to a genus which Prof. Cope now rejects, and when again applied, contrary to usage, to the genus *Tinoceras*, all the generic characters mentioned existed only in that author's imagination.

In a late number of "Nature" (February 27th, Vol. VII, p. 335), there is a report, written by Prof. Cope, of various meetings of the American Philosophical Society. This report, which was unauthorized by the society, contains several important misstatements. Under the meeting of August 16th, 1872, it is stated that "A communication from Prof. Cope was read on his discovery of '*Proboscidia* in the Wyoming Eocene,' * * * a new genus, *Eobasileus*, was described." The official records of this society show that no paper with this title, or on this subject was read at this meeting, and none was even presented until more than a month later, or September 20th. This misstatement is a serious one, since it is likely to mislead European naturalists as to the paper thus antedated. The description of "*Eobasileus*" as quoted in this report is quite different from that given in the paper when read, or as since published (February 6th, 1873), in the Proceedings of the Society, Vol. XII, p. 485. This makes at least the sixth time this genus has been antedated, and its supposed characters changed by Prof. Cope within as many months.

A circular has lately been issued by Prof. Cope requesting signatures from those who received his papers, the dates of which I have questioned. This circular quotes from my note on page 151,

but the quotation is incorrect, and conveys a very different meaning from the original. A signature to this circular can have no weight in the present discussion, as the document is so worded that it calls for no definite information whatever in regard to the real date of publication of any one of the doubtful papers. In this respect, and in its inaccuracy, the circular resembles perfectly Prof. Cope's other publications which I have recently criticised.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A Text-book of North American Ornithology. — Suitable manuals of zoology, treating of single classes of animals, have hitherto been desiderata in our zoological literature. The subject of the present brief notice — Dr. Elliott Coues' "Key to North American Birds"* — is a work unique in its conception, and the first of a kind one may well hope to see soon supplied for each class of our native animals, and especially for the several classes of the vertebrates. In these classes the number of species is small in comparison with the number of species of insects and of plants, and can be readily comprised in a volume of convenient size for a hand-book. Gray's admirable series of botanical text-books furnish guides to our flora that render accessible to the ordinary student and amateur a general knowledge of our plants, but until now we have had no similar handbook for any department of zoology.

The character of Dr. Coues' work, so far as fidelity of treatment and scientific accuracy are concerned, is sufficiently endorsed by the high character of his various special memoirs and monographs, and his high standing as an original investigator. The value of his "Key" as a text-book of American ornithology may be regarded as two-fold; first, its clear exposition of the latest and most generally approved views of the subject treated, and, secondly, its scope and the arrangement of the subject matter itself. A general "Introduction" treats of the leading principles of ornithology, and describes in detail, aided by suitable illustrations, the external

*Key to North American Birds, containing a concise account of every species of Living and Fossil Bird at present known from the Continent north of the Mexican and United States Boundary. Illustrated by 6 Steel Plates and upwards of 250 Woodcuts. By Elliott Coues, Assist. Surg. U.S. Army. Salem: Naturalists' Agency; New York, Dodd & Mead; Boston, Estes & Lauriat, 1872.